

REMARKS

Claims 30-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 30 and 31 are amended, and claims 38 and 39 are added. The claim amendments and added claims introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claims 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-A-2002-229916 (hereinafter "JP '916) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,255 B1 to Tomida. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

JP '916 provides a network fax apparatus having a function to carry out fax communications using a general public line and a LAN interface function that is adaptable to a computer network that enables the user to send and receive fax information by electronic mail. A functionality is provided in which a table to limit executable functions for each addressee in its own apparatus is provided. In other words, JP '916 describes a network fax apparatus having functionality to carry out fax communication and providing a function restriction/limitation table to limit executable functions for each email address in the network fax apparatus, the table being capable of performing the function limitation to its own apparatus for each email address. In this regard, JP '916 only performs function limitation to its own apparatus for each email address. It does not determine that received documents are those received by fax communications via the internet and restrict automatic printing by a setting unit storing the received documents, thereby restricting automatic printing by an automatic printing restriction unit to suppress printing costs on the receivers side. In other words, JP '916 cannot reasonably be relied upon as teaching the features recited in the pending claims upon which the Office Action relies upon this reference as teaching.

Independent claims 30 and 31 recite, among other features, a determining unit that determines whether the received documents received by the facsimile communications unit

Independent claims 30 and 31 recite, among other features, a determining unit that determines whether the received documents received by the facsimile communications unit are those received by the facsimile communications via Internet and an automatic printing restricting unit that stores the received documents and restricts the automatic printing by the automatic printing unit on the received documents when the received documents received by the facsimile communication unit are determined by the determining unit to be those received by the facsimile communications via Internet and for which the restriction of the automatic printing is set on the setting unit. JP '916 does not determine to store documents and/or restrict printing of documents based on any determination that can reasonably be considered to correspond to the determination made in the subject matter of the pending claims.

Tomida teaches an Internet facsimile device that enables one to obtain the general contents of a facsimile and to determine its urgency. Tomida neither stores the received documents nor selectively restricts automatic printing by any automatic restriction unit to suppress printing costs of the receiver if the received documents are those received by the facsimile communications via Internet and a restriction of automatic printing is set by a setting unit. As such, Tomida does not make up for the shortfalls in the application JP '916 to the subject matter of the pending claims.

For at least the above reasons, the combination of JP '916 and Tomida would not have suggested the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 30 and 31. Further, claims 32-37 also would not have been suggested by this combination of references for at least their dependence directly or indirectly on an allowable base claim, in addition to the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over the asserted combination of applied references are respectfully requested.

Added claims 38 and 39 are supported by Applicants' disclosure at least at page 8, lines 17-24. The features recited in claims 38 and 39 are not taught, nor would they have been suggested by the asserted combination of the applied references. For at least the respective dependence of these claims directly on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 30-39 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/add

Date: May 5, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
